

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
recent decision to
require their
affiliates to air an
anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election,
without allowing an
opposing viewpoint,
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.

The concentration
of media ownership
combined with a
desire to push an
unknown agenda to
the viewing public
introduces a
chilling effect on
our democracy by
interfering with the
ability of the
public to form an
informed opinion.

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, and is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest. But when a
few large media
groups control the
airwaves, we get
what's good for the
bottom line and very
little of what we
need for our
democracy. Instead
of having the access
to information
controlled by a few
unregulated groups
with hidden agendas,
it's extremely
important that we
see people from our
own communities with
substantive and
balanced news about
issues that matter
to us.

This example of
media abuse
demonstrates very
clearly why we need
to limit the
concentration of
media ownership to a
few select groups. I
urge you to
reconsider the

recent relaxation of
media ownership
rules. The public
needs to be able to
get differing
viewpoints if our
democracy is to
continue to thrive.
They show why the
license renewal
process needs to
involve more than
filling out the
paperwork. Thank
you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Proehl